

EXHIBIT 1

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TYLER DIVISION**

RAYLON, LLC, a Texas Limited Liability Company, Plaintiff, vs. EZ TAG CORPORATION, a Delaware Corporation; CASIO AMERICA, INC., a New York Corporation; and CASIO COMPUTER CO., LTD., a Japanese Corporation, Defendants.	C.A. No. 6:09-cv-357 (Davis)
--	---

DECLARATION OF SCOTT D. STIMPSON

I, Scott D. Stimpson, hereby declare:

1. I am a member of the firm Sills Cummis & Gross P.C., attorneys for defendants Casio America, Inc. and Casio Computer Co. Ltd. (collectively "Casio"). I submit this declaration in support of the motion of Casio for Rule 11 sanctions.
2. Attached hereto as Exhibit A is a true and correct copy of Plaintiff's Complaint, dated August 6, 2009.
3. Attached hereto as Exhibit B is a true and correct copy of U.S. Patent No. 6,655,589.
4. Attached hereto as Exhibit C is a true and correct copy of Casio America, Inc.'s Motion for Summary Judgment of Non-Infringement in the action entitled *Raylon, LLC v. Complus Data Innovations et al.*, No. 09-cv-355 (E.D. Tex.) (the "*Complus* action").

5. Attached hereto as Exhibit D is a true and correct copy of a IT-3000 Series Hardware Manual.

6. Attached hereto as Exhibit E is a true and correct copy of a IT-3100 Series Hardware Manual.

7. Attached hereto as Exhibit F is a true and correct copy of Raylon, LLC's opposition to Casio America, Inc.'s Motion for Summary Judgment of Non-Infringement in the *Complus* action.


8. Attached hereto as Exhibit G is a true and correct copy of Raylon, LLC's Supplemental Local Patent Rule 3-1 and 3-2 Disclosures.

9. Attached hereto as Exhibit H is a true and correct copy of a letter (without exhibits) from Carl Roth, counsel for Raylon, LLC, to Scott Stimpson, counsel for Casio.

10. Attached hereto as Exhibit I is a true and correct copy of the '589 Patent Prosecution History which was attached as Exhibit 4 to the May 28, 2010 letter from Carl Roth (*see* Exhibit H).

11. Attached hereto as Exhibit J is a true and correct copy of Casio's Reply Brief in Further Support of its Motion for Summary Judgment of Non-Infringement in the *Complus* action.

I declare under the penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.



SCOTT D. STIMPSON

Dated: June 21, 2010